



Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Removal of marketing assessment from public parcels/former contingency category

8 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM

To: Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?

2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
 DEVINE STRATEGIES
 645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
 Los Angeles, CA 90015
 310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Cc: Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Rosemary Hinkson <rosemary.hinkson@lacity.org>

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.

2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing – or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?

2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels

section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE

DEVINE STRATEGIES

645 West Ninth Street, #110-293

Los Angeles, CA 90015

310.430.5121

tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Rick Scott

Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division

Office of the City Clerk

213.978.1121 direct

213.978.1099 main

Fax 213.978.1130

Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:46 PM

To: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Thanks so much!

So I assume the term "advocacy" should not be used in the Administrative category, then?

RE: corresponding database edits

Unless told otherwise, I will apply a reduction to the assessment rates for all assessed public parcels that corresponds to the "District Identity & Special Projects" category (e.g. for Venice, it's 7%.) Applying the reduction to the total assessment seems sneaky/not transparent to someone looking at the database, so I'm going to apply it to each rate (bldg/lot/frontage) for each assessed gov't parcel. (NOTE: We do not use different factors (bldg, lot frontage) to generate specific budget categories - all budget categories are funded by all assessment factors.) Is that kosher on the database end, or should I check with Dennis on this question?

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM, Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.

2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing -- or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?

2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:59 PM

I understand, no problem.
RE: database, is my approach ok?

On Jan 12, 2015 3:53 PM, "Rick Scott" <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

We should probably discuss this tomorrow. The BIDs say they're not lobbyists but advocacy can be construed as lobbying.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Thanks so much!

So I assume the term "advocacy" should not be used in the Administrative category, then?

RE: corresponding database edits

Unless told otherwise, I will apply a reduction to the assessment rates for all assessed public parcels that corresponds to the "District Identity & Special Projects" category (e.g. for Venice, it's 7%.) Applying the reduction to the total assessment seems sneaky/not transparent to someone looking at the database, so I'm going to apply it to each rate (bldg/lot/frontage) for each assessed gov't parcel. (NOTE: We do not use different factors (bldg, lot frontage) to generate specific budget categories - all budget categories are funded by all assessment factors.) Is that kosher on the database end, or should I check with Dennis on this question?

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM, Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.

2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing – or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SP11 to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

- 1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?
- 2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 6:31 AM

I'm not sure I understand the question exactly. We'll discuss this morning.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:59 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I understand, no problem.
RE: database, is my approach ok?

On Jan 12, 2015 3:53 PM, "Rick Scott" <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

We should probably discuss this tomorrow. The BIDs say they're not lobbyists but advocacy can be construed as lobbying.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Thanks so much!

So I assume the term "advocacy" should not be used in the Administrative category, then?

RE: corresponding database edits

Unless told otherwise, I will apply a reduction to the assessment rates for all assessed public parcels that corresponds to the "District Identity & Special Projects" category (e.g. for Venice, it's 7%.) Applying the reduction to the total assessment seems sneaky/not transparent to someone looking at the database, so I'm going to apply it to each rate (bldg/lot/frontage) for each assessed gov't parcel. (NOTE: We do not use different factors (bldg, lot frontage) to generate specific budget categories - all budget categories are funded by all assessment factors.) Is that kosher on the database end, or should I check with Dennis on this question?

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM, Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.
2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing - or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

- 1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?
- 2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--
 Rick Scott
 Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
 Office of the City Clerk
 213.978.1121 direct
 213.978.1099 main
 Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--
 Rick Scott
 Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
 Office of the City Clerk
 213.978.1121 direct
 213.978.1099 main
 Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
 To: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 7:16 AM

Roger. See you in a bit.

Wondering how to adjust gov't assessments in the database to remove the marketing. Reducing all rates (\$0.08/\$0.011/\$29) by the % of budget devoted to marketing (aka district identity and special projects) seemed the most transparent way to present it.

Not sure if Ed dropped you a note or if he wanted me to share...he won't make it today. He emailed me late last night. Diane is not well and he was going to be taking her to the hospital last night or first thing today. Reading between the lines, I think her fight is winding down. I told him to take care of the home front first.

I'll take notes for both of us and share; if he has a question I can't answer, he may follow up with you.

I'm not sure I understand the question exactly. We'll discuss this morning.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:59 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I understand, no problem.
 RE: database, is my approach ok?

On Jan 12, 2015 3:53 PM, "Rick Scott" <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

We should probably discuss this tomorrow. The BIDs say they're not lobbyists but advocacy can be construed as lobbying.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
 Thanks so much!

So I assume the term "advocacy" should not be used in the Administrative category, then?

RE: corresponding database edits
 Unless told otherwise, I will apply a reduction to the assessment rates for all assessed public parcels that corresponds to the "District Identity & Special Projects" category (e.g. for Venice, it's 7%.) Applying the reduction to the total assessment seems sneaky/not transparent to someone looking at the database, so I'm going to apply it to each rate (bldg/lot/frontage) for each assessed gov't parcel. (NOTE: We do not use different factors (bldg, lot frontage) to generate specific budget categories - all budget categories are funded by all assessment factors.) Is that kosher on the database end, or should I check with Dennis on this question?

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM, Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.
2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing – or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

- 1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?
- 2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
[310.430.5121](tel:310.430.5121)
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
[213.978.1121](tel:213.978.1121) direct
[213.978.1099](tel:213.978.1099) main
Fax [213.978.1130](tel:213.978.1130)
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
[213.978.1121](tel:213.978.1121) direct
[213.978.1099](tel:213.978.1099) main
Fax [213.978.1130](tel:213.978.1130)
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division

Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 7:28 AM

Wow! Sorry to hear that about Ed. I've known him for almost 20 years. We saw the Moody Blues at the Greek years ago.

Yes. Adjusting the rates in the database, along with the wording in the plan is the way. Remember, the MDP and ER must demonstrate that each parcel is paying the correct amount for the benefit it receives.

On Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 7:16 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Roger. See you in a bit.

Wondering how to adjust gov't assessments in the database to remove the marketing. Reducing all rates (\$0.08/\$0.011/\$29) by the % of budget devoted to marketing (aka district identity and special projects) seemed the most transparent way to present it.

Not sure if Ed dropped you a note or if he wanted me to share...he won't make it today. He emailed me late last night. Diane is not well and he was going to be taking her to the hospital last night or first thing today. Reading between the lines, I think her fight is winding down. I told him to take care of the home front first.

I'll take notes for both of us and share; if he has a question I can't answer, he may follow up with you.

I'm not sure I understand the question exactly. We'll discuss this morning.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:59 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I understand, no problem.
RE: database, is my approach ok?

On Jan 12, 2015 3:53 PM, "Rick Scott" <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

We should probably discuss this tomorrow. The BIDs say they're not lobbyists but advocacy can be construed as lobbying.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Thanks so much!

So I assume the term "advocacy" should not be used in the Administrative category, then?

RE: corresponding database edits

Unless told otherwise, I will apply a reduction to the assessment rates for all assessed public parcels that corresponds to the "District Identity & Special Projects" category (e.g. for Venice, it's 7%.) Applying the reduction to the total assessment seems sneaky/not transparent to someone looking at the database, so I'm going to apply it to each rate (bldg/lot/frontage) for each assessed gov't parcel. (NOTE: We do not use different factors (bldg, lot frontage) to generate specific budget categories - all budget categories are funded by all assessment factors.) Is that kosher on the database end, or should I check with Dennis on this question?

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM, Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.

2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing -- or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?

2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 7:33 AM

Stage 4 kidney cancer. He said she's been fighting bravely for 8 years.

On Jan 13, 2015 7:28 AM, "Rick Scott" <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

Wow! Sorry to hear that about Ed. I've known him for almost 20 years. We saw the Moody Blues at the Greek years ago.

Yes. Adjusting the rates in the database, along with the wording in the plan is the way. Remember, the MDP and ER must demonstrate that each parcel is paying the correct amount for the benefit it receives.

On Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 7:16 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Roger. See you in a bit.

Wondering how to adjust gov't assessments in the database to remove the marketing. Reducing all rates (\$0.08/\$0.011/\$29) by the % of budget devoted to marketing (aka district identity and special projects) seemed the most transparent way to present it.

Not sure if Ed dropped you a note or if he wanted me to share...he won't make it today. He emailed me late last night. Diane is not well and he was going to be taking her to the hospital last night or first thing today. Reading between the lines, I think her fight is winding down. I told him to take care of the home front first.

I'll take notes for both of us and share; if he has a question I can't answer, he may follow up with you.

I'm not sure I understand the question exactly. We'll discuss this morning.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:59 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I understand, no problem.

RE: database, is my approach ok?

On Jan 12, 2015 3:53 PM, "Rick Scott" <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

We should probably discuss this tomorrow. The BIDs say they're not lobbyists but advocacy can be construed as lobbying.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Thanks so much!

So I assume the term "advocacy" should not be used in the Administrative category, then?

RE: corresponding database edits

Unless told otherwise, I will apply a reduction to the assessment rates for all assessed public parcels that corresponds to the "District Identity & Special Projects" category (e.g. for Venice, it's 7%.) Applying the reduction to the total assessment seems sneaky/not transparent to someone looking at the database, so I'm going to apply it to each rate (bldg/lot/frontage) for each assessed gov't parcel. (NOTE: We do not use different factors (bldg, lot frontage) to generate specific budget categories - all budget categories are funded by all assessment factors.) Is that kosher on the database end, or should I check with Dennis on this question?

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:37 PM, Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org> wrote:

1. Contingency is the only thing that you can't show special benefit for. 'City fees' is a cost and can be placed under admin or even its own category but admin's probably best. The special benefit of delinquency is that the services keep to a certain level even if not everyone pays right away. The

rollover of it should be spread out over the categories. Everything's kinda jammed with just a two-year BID though.

2. Bottom line is that each parcel pays for its special benefit. Public parcels, unless they're leased out to a commercial venture that pays the assessment, don't benefit from marketing because they don't sell anything and aren't trying to attract customers, i.e.; don't need or benefit from marketing -- or advocacy either for that matter because that would be conflict of interest.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:25 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I'm redoing the budget categories for Venice (with SPII to follow) - removal of contingency category and assessment reductions (marketing/special projects deducted from all assessed public parcels.)

Just two quick verification questions:

1) Contingency/Delinquency/City Fees should be redistributed among the other categories, with city fee/formation costs attributed to the Admin/Mgmt category, and the balance spread across the other budget categories as appropriate, correct?

2) In Venice, our "District Identity & Special Projects" category = 7% of the overall budget. Therefore, all (assessed) public parcels' assessments should be reduced by 7%, and brief language should be added to the public parcels section (and the District Identity & Special Projects) that says that public parcels will not receive any special benefits from District Identity & Special Projects. Correct?

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth Street, #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

--
Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct

213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org

-

Rick Scott
Neighborhood and Business Improvement District Division
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1121 direct
213.978.1099 main
Fax 213.978.1130
Rick.Scott@lacity.org